arXiv:1612.09492v1 [math.PR] 30 Dec 2016

Algorithmically random Fourier series and Brownian motion

Paul Potgieter
Department of Decision Sciences, University of South Africa
P.O. Box 392, Pretoria 0003, South Africa
potgip@unisa.ac.za

Abstract

We consider some random series parametrised by complex binary strings. The simplest case is that of Rademacher series, independent of a time parameter. This is then extended to the case of Fourier series on the circle with Rademacher coefficients. Finally, a specific Fourier series which has coefficients determined by a computable function is shown to converge to an algorithmically random Brownian motion.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) Primary 68Q30, 42A20; secondary 42A38, 60G15

1 Introduction

There has been much success in recent years in interpreting probabilistic phenomena in the language of algorithmic randomness. Of particular interest to our current investigations are the effective versions of the Borel-Cantelli lemmas by Davie [2] and the construction of algorithmically random Brownian motion by Fouché [4]. Using these, it has been shown that many effectivised properties of Brownian motion hold for a version of Brownian motion parametrised by Kolmogorov-Chaitin complex strings. Important examples of such properties are the law of the iterated logarithm [7] and results on the Fourier spectra of measures on the images of fractals [6].

The aim of the first part of the paper (sections 2 and 3) is to formulate convergence and divergence results for algorithmically random Rademacher series which are determined by KC-strings. This allows us to state with certainty when certain series will converge. The proofs rely on certain Kolmogorov and Paley-Zygmund inequalities in Hilbert space. Although only the real case is considered, the proofs should be transferable to other spaces where a suitable notion of computability is defined. We then turn to establishing similar results for trigonometric series with coefficients again determined by Rademacher series. In particular, we will show that under suitable conditions, the algorithmically random Rademacher series forms the Fourier coefficients of a Borel measure on $[0, 1]$. As possible future work, it would be interesting to study the class of such measures in terms of computability.

The second part of the paper (sections 4 and 5) is concerned with the convergence of computably determined series to continuous functions. This is done firstly for algorithmically random Rademacher series. We then consider a particular series, the Fourier-Wiener series, used in a construction of Brownian motion, and show that this not only converges to a continuous function, but to a complex oscillation in the sense of Asarin and Pokrovskii. This provides an alternative to Fouché's construction of algorithmically random Brownian motion [4].

The probabilistic aspects of this paper are heavily influenced by the exposition of Kahane [8]. For computability aspects, we shall throughout notation similar to that used in [4], which we summarise here.

We denote the set of non-negative integers by ω and write $\mathcal{N}$ for the space $\{-1, 1\}^\omega$. The subset of finite strings is denoted by $\{-1, 1\}^*$. For $\alpha = \alpha_0\alpha_1 \dots$ in $\mathcal{N}$, we write $\overline{\alpha}(n) = \prod_{j<n} \alpha_j$ for the intitial segment of α of length n. For $a \in \{-1, 1\}^*$, we write $|a|$ for the length of a and $[a]$ for the interval generated by a; that is, the set $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{N} : \overline{\alpha}(|a|) = a\}$. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$, we denote the Kolmogorov complexity of α by $K(\alpha)$, and say that α is Kolmogorov-Chaitin complex if $\exists k \forall n K(\overline{\alpha}(n)) \geq n - k$. The set of Kolmogorov-Chaitin complex strings shall be denoted by KC.

A sequence (a_n) of real numbers is said to converge to 0 effectively if there is some computable function $f : \omega \to \omega$ such that $|a_n| \leq (m+1)^{-1}$ whenever $n \geq f(m)$, for all $n, m \in \omega$. Letting λ be the Lebesgue probability measure over $\mathcal{N}$, we say that a subset A of $\mathcal{N}$ has constructive measure 0 if there is a computable function $g : \omega^2 \to \{-1, 1\}^*$ such that $A \subset \cap_n \cup_m [g(n, m)]$, where $\lambda(\cup_m [g(n, m)])$ converges effectively to 0 as $n \to \infty$.

We shall use the following theorems or their probabilistic analogues repeatedly.

Theorem 1.1. *[9] If $\alpha \in KC$, α is in the complement of every set of constructive measure 0.*

Theorem 1.2. *[5] If B is a Σ^0_1 set of Lebesgue measure 1, then B contains KC.*

This theorem has the converse:

Theorem 1.3. *A Π^0_1 set of Lebesgue measure 0 contains no element of KC.*

The following is an effective version of the Borel-Cantelli lemmas.

Lemma 1.1. *[2] Let $\{A_k\}$ be a uniform sequence of Σ^0_1 sets.*

(i) If $\sum_k \lambda(A_k) < \infty$, then, for each $\alpha \in KC$, it is this case that α belongs to no A_k for sufficiently large k.

(ii) If the events $\{A_k\}$ are pairwise independent and $\sum_k \lambda(A_k) = \infty$, then A_k must occur infinitely often for each $\alpha \in KC$.

Corresponding notions for Wiener measure will not be needed until section 5, and will only be introduced then.

2 Algorithmically random Rademacher series

The goal of this section is to establish convergence and divergence results for algorithmically random Rademacher series. Since the convergence of a Rademacher series is a tail phenomenon, a given series converges almost surely, or diverges almost surely. In this section we will show that if a Rademacher series of a computable sequence of numbers converges a.s., it will converge for each KC-string as long as the l^2 norm of the sequence is a computable number. Conversely, we show that if a Rademacher series of a computable sequence of numbers diverges, it diverges for each KC-string. A consequence of this is that convergence/divergence for all KC-strings can be determined by the convergence/divergence of any one such string.

A Rademacher sequence on a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ is defined as a sequence (ε_n) of random variables on X such that $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_n = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_n = -1) = 1/2$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. In this paper, we examine Rademacher sequences parametrised by $\mathcal{N}$, which is to say that for some $x \in \mathcal{N}$, $\varepsilon_n(x) = -1$ or 1 according to whether the nth bit of x is -1 or 1. A Rademacher series in a Hilbert (or Banach) space is a series of the form $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n u_n$, where (ε_n) is a Rademacher sequence and (u_n) is a sequence of vectors in a Hilbert (or Banach) space. We shall only concern ourselves with real sequences (u_n). A sequence (ε_n) is called an *algorithmically random* Rademacher sequence if there is some $\alpha \in KC$ such that ε_k is the kth bit of α. When it is necessary to specify α, the sequence is denoted by $(\varepsilon_n(\alpha))$.

A sequence (x_n) of real numbers is said to be a *computable sequence* if there is an effective way of approximating x_n arbitrarily closely, given n. We shall say that a computable sequence of real numbers (x_n) is *square computable* if there is an effective procedure for determining the sum $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k^2$ to arbitrary accuracy from (x_n). In other words, given a positive integer m, there is an effective procedure for finding $n = n(m)$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k^2 \right| < 1/m. \tag{2.1}$$

Throughout, $\mathbb{E}(X)$ shall denote the expected value of a random variable X, and $V(X) = \mathbb{E}((X - \mathbb{E}(X))^2)$ its variance. All events considered are members of the usual Borel σ-algebra over $\mathcal{N}$, and the probability measure is denoted by $\mathbb{P}$ rather than λ, in order to maintain a more uniform notation.

The first relevant theorem is the following. For generality, we phrase the theorem with the sequence (u_n) considered as a sequence in a Hilbert space H, with $\|\cdot\|$ denoting the norm associated with the inner product on H.

Theorem 2.1. *([8] p30) Suppose that $X_n \in L^2_H(\Omega)$ are independent random variables and $\mathbb{E}(X_n) = 0$ for each n, and $\sum_1^\infty V(X_n) < \infty$. Then the series $\sum_1^\infty X_n$ converges in H a.s.*

In particular, if our variables are $X_n = \varepsilon_n u_n$ for a Rademacher sequence (ε_n) and if $\sum_1^\infty \|u_n\|^2 < \infty$, then $\sum_1^\infty \varepsilon_n u_n$ converges a.s. In the sequel, we shall omit the use of subscripts and superscripts in the summation unless confusion is likely.

In order to prove a version of the theorem for complex strings, we shall need an inequality of Kolmogorov, which is also used in the proof of the Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.2. *([8] p29) Supposing that $X_n \in L^2_H(\Omega)$ are independent random variables and $\mathbb{E}(X_n) = 0$ for each n, we have for any N*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{n=1,2,\ldots,N} \|X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_n\| > r\right) < \frac{1}{r^2}\left(V(X_1) + V(X_2) + \cdots + V(X_N)\right). \tag{2.2}$$

We can now prove a version of Theorem 2.1 for complex strings.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that (u_n) is a square computable sequence in $\mathbb{R}$, and (ε_n) is an algorithmically random Rademacher sequence. Then $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ converges in $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Consider the event

$$B_n^{(k)} = \left(\sup_{j\geq 1}\left|\sum_{l=n}^{n+j} \varepsilon_l u_l\right| > \frac{1}{k}\right) \tag{2.3}$$

for some positive integer k. By equation (2.2),

$$\mathbb{P}(B_n^{(k)}) < k^2 \sum_n^\infty u_n^2. \tag{2.4}$$

Since we require that (u_n) is square computable, we can effectively determine, for each m, an $n = n(m)$ such that $k^2 \sum_n^\infty u_n^2$ is smaller than $1/m^2$.

Note that we can describe $B_n^{(k)}$ as

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty \left(\left|\sum_{l=n}^{n+j} \varepsilon_l u_l\right| > \frac{1}{k}\right). \tag{2.5}$$

Thus B_n^k is a countable union of finitely determined events, and is therefore a $\sum_1^0$ set. Similarly, since $n(m)$ can be effectively determined, the sequence $\{B^{(k)}_{n(m)}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ forms a uniform sequence of $\sum_1^0$ sets. Moreover, the sum of the measures of the sets converges. By the effective version of the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have that for a complex string α that $\alpha \notin B^{(k)}_{n(m)}$ for all large values of m. Therefore, given any positive $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that, for large enough values of n,

$$\sup_j \left|\sum_{l=n}^{n+j} \varepsilon_l u_l\right| \leq \frac{1}{k}. \tag{2.6}$$

We can conclude that the series converges for each complex string. □

The converse of Theorem 2.1 for a general Hilbert space is the following.

Theorem 2.4. *([8] p31) Suppose that $\|X_n\| \in L^4(\Omega)$ are independent random variables, $\mathbb{E}(X_n) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\|X_n\|^4) \leq CV^2(X_n)$ for all n, for some absolute constant $C > 0$. If the series $\sum X_n$ is a.s. bounded, then $\sum_1^\infty V(X_n) < \infty$.*

This has the trivial corollary:

Corollary 2.1. *For any sequence of real numbers (u_n) (computable or not), if $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ is bounded for each KC string, then $\sum u_n^2 < \infty$.*

When the sum $\sum_1^\infty u_n^2$ diverges, the Rademacher series $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ will almost surely diverge ([8], p31). For complex strings, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *If (u_n) is a computable sequence such that $\sum u_n^2 = \infty$, then $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ diverges for each algorithmically random Rademacher sequence (ε_n).*

We shall need the following Paley-Zygmund inequality for the proof.

Lemma 2.1. *([8] p31) If (u_n) is a sequence of vectors in a Hilbert space and (ε_n) is a Rademacher sequence, then for any $0 < \lambda < 1$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\varepsilon_1 u_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_m u_m\| > \lambda(\|u_1\|^2 + \cdots + \|u_m\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}] > \frac{1}{3}(1-\lambda^2)^2. \tag{2.7}$$

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We can interpret Lemma 2.1 as follows: For any positive integer m,

$$\mathbb{P}[|\varepsilon_1 u_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_m u_m| > \lambda] > \frac{1}{3}(1-\gamma^2)^2, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{\lambda}{(u_1^2 + \cdots + u_m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \tag{2.9}$$

In order for the inequality to apply, we need that $0 < \gamma < 1$. Since $\sum u_n^2$ diverges, we can take m large enough in the above so that this is true for a given value of λ. Moreover, if λ is computable, the smallest such m can be effectively determined. For ease of computation, we set $\lambda = 1/2$. We can now effectively find m_1 so that the associated value of γ is between 0 and 1 and

$$\eta_{m_1} = \frac{1}{3}(1-\gamma_{m_1}^2)^2 = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{u_1^2 + \cdots + u_{m_1}^2}\right) > \frac{1}{6}. \tag{2.10}$$

Since the inequality (2.7) applies to all finite subsequences of (u_n), given m_k we can effectively find $m_{k+1} > m_k$ so that

$$\eta_{m_{k+1}} = \frac{1}{3}(1-\gamma_{m_{k+1}}^2)^2 = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{u_{m_k+1}^2 + \cdots + u_{m_{k+1}}^2}\right) > \frac{1}{6}. \tag{2.11}$$

Continuing in this way, we can effectively determine m_{n+k}, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. The events $(|\varepsilon_{m_k+1} u_{m_k+1} + \cdots + \varepsilon_{m_{k+1}} u_{m_{k+1}}| > \lambda)$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, are independent finitely determined events, and moreover have probabilities that sum to ∞. This means, by the second effective Borel-Cantelli lemma, that they must occur infinitely often for complex strings. This implies that the sum for a complex string will always have sections of the tail which are larger than $1/2$ in absolute value, implying divergence. □

Corollary 2.2. *If (u_n) is a square computable sequence in $\mathbb{R}$ and $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ converges for any $\alpha \in KC$, then $\sum u_n^2$ converges. If $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ diverges for any $\alpha \in KC$, $\sum u_n^2$ must diverge or converge to an incomputable number.*

Proof. Since the series $\sum u_n^2$ has only positive terms, it must converge or diverge to ∞. However, divergence implies that $\sum \varepsilon_n u_n$ also diverges. The second statement follows similarly. □

We end the section with a principle of contraction for KC-strings. The original can be found in [8], p20.

Theorem 2.6. *If (u_n) is a square computable sequence, then for a bounded computable sequence (λ_n) with $\sup_n |\lambda_n|$ computable, the series $\sum \varepsilon_n \lambda_n u_n$ converges for each algorithmically random Rademacher sequence (ε_n).*

Proof. The proof follows that of Theorem 2.3, by replacing $\sum |u_n|^2$ by $(\sup |\lambda_n|) \sum u_n^2$. □

3 Algorithmically random Fourier series

In this section, we consider algorithmically random versions of series of the form

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X_n \cos(2\pi nt + \Phi_n), \tag{3.1}$$

for independent symmetric random variables $X_n e^{2\pi i \Phi_n}$, $n \geq 0$, and $t \in [0,1]$. In particular, we let $X_n = \varepsilon_n x_n$, where x_n and $\phi_n = \Phi_n$ are fixed real numbers and (ε_n) a Rademacher sequence parametrised by $\mathcal{N}$, for $n \geq 0$. Our purpose is to establish conditions on the various parameters in order to obtain convergence or divergence for series

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n(\alpha) x_n \cos(2\pi nt + \phi_n) \tag{3.2}$$

where $(\varepsilon_n(\alpha))$ is an algorithmically random Rademacher sequence. A discussion of the general case can be found in Chapter 5 of [8].

A trigonometric series

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x_n \cos(2\pi nt + \phi_n) \tag{3.3}$$

with x_n, $\phi_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 0$ is said to be a Fourier-Stieltjes series if there exists a measure μ on $[0,1]$ such that

$$x_0 \cos 2\pi\phi_0 = \int d\mu(t) \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$x_n e^{\pm 2\pi i \phi_n} = 2 \int e^{\pm 2\pi i n t} d\mu(t), \quad n \geq 1. \tag{3.5}$$

We say that (3.3) $\in M$ if it is a Fourier-Stieltjes series.

The Fejér sums of (3.1) are given by

$$\sigma_N(t,\omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right) X_n(\omega) \cos(2\pi nt + \Phi_n(\omega)), \quad N = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{3.6}$$

If the Fejér sum of a series diverges, the series itself will diverge, although the converse is not necessarily true. We shall denote the Fejér sum by $\sigma_N(t)$, since the involvement of ω will usually be clear. Letting $\|\cdot\|_1$ denote the $L^1([0,1])$ norm, we have that (p136, [10])

$$(3.3) \in M \iff \sup_N \|\sigma_N\|_1 < \infty. \tag{3.7}$$

By Theorem 1 on p13 of [8], we can conclude that

$$(3.1) \in M \text{ a.s.} \iff \sup_N \|\sigma_N\|_1 < \infty \text{ a.s.} \tag{3.8}$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let (x_n), (ϕ_n) be computable sequences of real numbers so that $\sum x_n^2 = \infty$ and let $(\varepsilon_n(\alpha))$ be an algorithmically random Rademacher sequence. Then,*

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \int_0^1 |\sigma_N(t)| dt = \infty. \tag{3.9}$$

Thus, given a computable sequence (x_n) such that $\sum x_n^2$ diverges, the series (3.2) will not be a Fourier-Stieltjes series if $\alpha \in KC$. This partially answers the question of why it is difficult to explicitly construct a series of the form $\sum \pm x_n \cos(2\pi nt + \varphi_n)$ which is not a Fourier-Stieltjes series when $\sum x_n^2 = \infty$, even though it happens almost surely.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Each of the σ_N is a continuous function over a closed and bounded interval and we can approximate the integral by a Riemann sum. For a given M, we subdivide the interval $[0,1]$ into intervals of length $1/M$. Consider the event

$$B_K = \exists N \exists M \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} |\sigma_N(k/M)| > K \right), \tag{3.10}$$

where K is a positive integer. By Proposition 6 on p50 of [8], each B_K has probability 1. What is more, each B_K is a Σ_1^0 set, and therefore must contain all of KC. □

The following lemma tells us something of pointwise divergence.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (x_n), (ϕ_n) be computable sequences so that $\sum x_n^2 = \infty$ and let $(\varepsilon_n(\alpha))$ be an algorithmically random Rademacher sequence. Then the series (3.2) diverges for almost every $t \in [0,1]$.*

Proof. The key to the proof is to adapt the second proof of Proposition 6, used in the previous theorem. There it is proved that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \int_0^1 |\sigma_N(t)| dt = \infty, \tag{3.11}$$

almost surely. Since the Paley-Zygmund inequality used in the proof is valid for all t and N, and since by Proposition 4 on p49 of [8] the series

$$\sum_1^\infty x_n^2 \cos^2(2\pi nt + \phi_n) \tag{3.12}$$

diverges a.e., it is permissible to consider any closed interval of $[0,1]$ in the proof, rather than the interval itself. If $I = [a,b]$ is such an interval, the proof then implies that

$$\limsup_{N\to\infty} \int_I |\sigma_N(t)| dt = \infty, \tag{3.13}$$

almost surely. Letting $I = [k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}]$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 2^j - 1\}$ be any dyadic subinterval of $[0,1]$, and considering the Riemann sum as in the previous proof, this means that the event

$$B_{K,j,k} = \exists N \exists M \left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} \left| \sigma_N \left(\left(k + \frac{n}{M} \right) 2^{-j} \right) \right| > K \right] \tag{3.14}$$

has measure 1. Since it is Σ_1^0, it must hold for every $\alpha \in KC$. Hence, the integral of $|\sigma_N(t)|$ diverges over arbitrarily small intervals as $N \to \infty$, which implies that the Fejér sum and hence the series diverges a.e. □

We now turn to the subject of convergence. Convergence almost everywhere on $[0,1]$ when $\sum x_n^2 < \infty$ is actually the least interesting case. For fixed $\alpha \in KC$, the coefficients form a square summable sequence and hence the Fourier series converges in norm to an element of $L^2([0,1])$. The Fejér sums then have to converge to a function in $L^1([0,1])$, which means that $\sup_N \|\sigma_N\|_1$ must be bounded, implying that (3.2) $\in M$. Imposing certain constructive constraints on the measures in question might lead to results of greater interest. However, we can say something about the convergence at computable numbers.

Theorem 3.2. *If (x_n) is a square computable sequence and (ϕ_n) is a computable sequence, the series (3.2) converges at each computable number for each $\alpha \in KC$.*

Proof. Noting that $(x_n \cos(2\pi nt + \phi_n))$ is a computable sequence such that the absolute value of the nth term is bounded by $|x_n|$, the proof of Theorem 2.3 can be applied directly. □

4 Series as continuous functions

In our construction of algorithmically random Brownian motion, it will be key to show that certain Fourier series converge to continuous functions. The notation and method of proof of the following theorem for algorithmically random Rademacher Fourier series will be important.

For random variables X_n, each with finite variance and expectation 0, we set

$$s_j = \left(\sum_{2^j \leq n < 2^{j+1}} \mathbb{E}(X_n^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{4.1}$$

In the case to be considered below, we have that $X_n = \varepsilon_n x_n$, where the x_n are now fixed real numbers, and (ε_n) is a Rademacher sequence parametrised by $\mathcal{N}$, and

$$s_j = \left(\sum_{2^j \leq n < 2^{j+1}} x_n^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{4.2}$$

Theorem 4.1. *Whenever $X_n = \varepsilon_n x_n$, where (ε_n) is an algorithmically random Rademacher sequence and (x_n), (ϕ_n) are computable sequences, (s_j) is a decreasing sequence and $\sum_1^\infty s_j$ is finite, the Fourier series (3.2) converges to a continuous function.*

Proof. As in [8], we set

$$P_k(t) = \sum_{N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} \varepsilon_n x_n \cos(2\pi n t + \phi_n), \tag{4.3}$$

where $N_k = 2^{2^k}$. Let B_k be the event

$$\|P_k\|_\infty > 6 \left(\log N_{k+1} \sum_{N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} x_n^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{4.4}$$

By theorem 2 on p69 of [8], presented in this paper as Theorem 5.3,

$$\mathbb{P}(B_k) \leq \frac{8\pi}{N_{k+1}^2}. \tag{4.5}$$

The theorem is applicable because (X_n) is a subnormal sequence, that is, the variables are independent and satisfy $\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_n}) \leq e^{\lambda^2/2}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Since each P_k is a continuous computable function, we can state the lower bound on the uniform norm in terms of rational numbers. Setting

$$F(k) = \left(\log N_{k+1} \sum_{N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} x_n^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{4.6}$$

we can describe the event B_k as

$$\exists M \exists n \leq M \left(\left| P_k \left(\frac{n}{M} \right) \right| > 6F(k) \right). \tag{4.7}$$

The events (B_k) therefore form a uniform sequence of Σ_1^0 sets, and the sum of all their probabilities is clearly finite. Therefore, for any algorithmically random Rademacher sequence (ε_n),

$$\|P_k\|_\infty \leq 6 \left(2^{k/2} \left(\sum_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}-1} s_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \tag{4.8}$$

for large k. If we now require that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} s_j < \infty$ and that the sequence s_j is decreasing, we have that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{k/2} \left(\sum_{2^k}^{2^{k+1}-1} s_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty. \tag{4.9}$$

Therefore, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|P_k\|_\infty < \infty$, and the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P_k(t)$ must be uniformly convergent. □

It would now be natural to ask what would happen in a more general case where, instead of a Rademacher sequence, one has a sequence of independent, identically distributed random variables (for which a notion of computability is suitably defined) as coefficients. Although we cannot yet formulate a general result, the next section provides a specific instance of convergence.

5 Algorithmically random Brownian motion

We require some background in order to phrase analogues of Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 1.1 for Wiener measure. For a more complete introduction, see [4] and [3]. Throughout, $\mathbb{W}$ shall denote Wiener measure on Σ, the Borel σ-algebra over $C[0,1]$ (topologised by the uniform norm).

Let C_n, $n \geq 1$ be the class of elements of $C[0,1]$ that vanish at 0 and are linear with slope $\pm\sqrt{n}$ on the intervals $[(i-1)/n, i/n]$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots n$. It is clear that each $x \in C_n$ can be encoded by a binary string $c(x) = a_1 \cdots a_n$ in $\{-1, 1\}^*$ by setting $a_i = 1$ if the slope is positive on $[(i-1)/n, i/n]$ and $a_i = -1$ otherwise. A sequence (x_n) in $C[0,1]$ is *complex* if for each n, $x_n \in C_n$ and there exists a constant $d > 0$ (independent of n) such that $K(c(x_n)) \geq n - d$ for all n. A function $x \in C[0,1]$ is a *complex oscillation* if there is a complex sequence (x_n) such that $\|x - x_n\|_\infty$ converges effectively to 0 as $n \to \infty$. The collection of complex oscillations will be denoted by $\mathcal{C}$.

The next notion needed is that of an *effective generating sequence*, formulated by Fouché in [3]. Since we shall only use one example of such in this section, we do not present the general definition, only an instance thereof. Let $\mathcal{G}_0$ be a collection of sets in Σ of the form

$$a_1 X(t_1) + \cdots + a_n X(t_n) \leq L \quad \text{or} \quad a_1 X(t_1) + \cdots + a_n X(t_n) < L \tag{5.1}$$

where X is a one-dimensional Brownian motion on $[0,1]$, the a_j, $0 \leq t_j \leq 1$ are rational numbers and L is a computable real. Let $(G_i : i < \omega)$ be an enumeration of $\mathcal{G}_0$ such that for any given i, the sign, denominator and numerator of each of the a_j, t_j in the representation (5.1) can be effectively computed, and the real L can be approximated arbitrarily closely.

For $G \in \mathcal{G}_0$, the open ε-neighbourhood $O_\varepsilon(G)$ of G as given by (5.1) is described by

$$a_1 X(t_1) + \cdots + a_n X(t_n) < L + \varepsilon \sum_j |a_j|. \tag{5.2}$$

The neighbourhood $O_\varepsilon(G^c)$ of G^c is described by

$$a_1 X(t_1) + \cdots + a_n X(t_n) > L - \varepsilon \sum_j |a_j|. \tag{5.3}$$

It is shown in [4] that $\mathcal{G}_0 = (G_i : i < \omega)$ satisfies the following conditions, and hence forms an effective generating sequence:

1. For $G \in \mathcal{G}_0$, we have for $F = O_\varepsilon(G)$, $F = O_\varepsilon(G^c)$, $F = G$ or $F = G^c$ that $\mathbb{W}(F) = \mathbb{W}(\overline{F})$.
2. There is an effective procedure that yields, for each sequence $0 \leq i_i < \cdots < i_n < \omega$ and $k < \omega$, a binary rational β_k such that
$$|\mathbb{W}(G_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap G_{i_n}) - \beta_k| < 2^{-k}. \tag{5.4}$$
In other words, the Wiener measure of finite intersections of elements of $\mathcal{G}_0$ is computable.

3. For $n, i < \omega$, a rational number $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in C_n$, both the relations $x \in O_\varepsilon(G_n)$ and $x \in O_\varepsilon(G_n^c)$ are computable in x, ε, i and n.

From an effective generating sequence $\mathcal{G}_0$ we can generate an algebra $\mathcal{G}$ in an effective way, i.e. there will be an enumeration $(T_i : i < \omega)$ of $\mathcal{G}$ such that, for given i, we can effectively describe T_i as a finite union of finite intersections of elements of $\mathcal{G}_0$ or their complements. The sequence $(T_i : i < \omega)$ is called a *computable enumeration* of $\mathcal{G}$, and we can refer to $\mathcal{G}$ as an *effectively generated algebra*.

We now present analogues in Σ of the arithmetical sets we have used in the previous sections, and for which versions of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and Lemma 1.1 will hold.

A sequence (A_n) of sets in $\mathcal{G}$ is $\mathcal{G}$-computably enumerable if it is of the form $(A_n = S_{\phi(n)})$ for some total computable function $\phi : \omega \to \omega$ and (S_i) a computable enumeration of $\mathcal{G}$. The union $\cup_n A_n$ is then a $\Sigma_1^0(\mathcal{G})$ set. The complement of such is a $\Pi_1^0(\mathcal{G})$ set. A sequence (B_n) in $\mathcal{G}$ is a *uniform sequence* of $\Sigma_1^0(\mathcal{G})$ sets if there is a total computable function $\phi : \omega^2 \to \omega$ and a computable enumeration (S_i) of $\mathcal{G}$ such that

$$B_n = \cup_m S_{\phi(n,m)}. \tag{5.5}$$

The intersection $\cap_n B_n$ is a $\Pi_2^0(\mathcal{G})$ set. If the Wiener measure of B_n converges effectively to 0 as $n \to \infty$, the set $\cap_n B_n$ is said to be a $\Pi_2^0(\mathcal{G})$ set of constructive measure 0.

The analogue of Theorem 1.1 is the following.

Theorem 5.1. *[3] Let $\mathcal{G}$ be an effectively generated algebra. If x is a complex oscillation, then x is in the complement of every $\Pi_2^0(\mathcal{G})$ set of constructive measure 0.*

We also have an analogue for the effective version of the Borel-Cantelli lemma for Wiener measure.

Theorem 5.2. *[3] If (A_k) is a uniform sequence of Σ_1^0 sets with $\sum_k \mathbb{W}(A_k) < \infty$, then for a complex oscillation x there is some m such that $x \notin A_k$ for $k \geq m$.*

We can now proceed to construct algorithmically random Brownian motion. Suppose we have a sequence of (real) independent random variables $X_0, X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2, \ldots$ such that each is a normal random variable of mean 0 and variance 1. From here on, we will refer to such a sequence simply as a *normal sequence*. We define the Fourier-Wiener series for $t \in [0, 1]$ as

$$W(t) = X_0 t + \sqrt{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi n} (X_n \sin 2\pi n t + Y_n (1 - \cos 2\pi n t)). \tag{5.6}$$

As usual, we suppress the argument ω in each of the random variables. When the series is parametrised by some $\alpha \in KC$, we denote it by $W_\alpha(t)$. By Theorem 2 on p236 of [8], the series represents the sample paths of a real Brownian motion on $[0, 1]$. In this section we show that the normal sequence can be chosen to be computable and in such a way that the series (5.6) represents an algorithmically random Brownian motion. The sequence in question was used by Fouché in [4] in order to construct the algoritmically random Brownian motion as a Franklin-Wiener series. As in [4], we show that not only does the series converge to a continuous function, but it is a complex oscillation in the sense of Asarin and Pokrovskii [1].

We now show how to construct a normal sequence which is parametrised by $\mathcal{N}$, as was first demonstrated in [4]. Define the function $g : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{g(\alpha)} e^{-t^2/2} dt, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1). \tag{5.7}$$

Note that g is a computable function. Now, fix a computable bijection $\varphi : \omega^2 \to \omega$. Associate to $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$ the sequence (β_n) such that the kth term of (β_n) is given by $\beta_k = \alpha_{\varphi(k,0)} \alpha_{\varphi(k,1)} \alpha_{\varphi(k,2)} \ldots$. Set $\xi_n(\alpha) = g(\beta_n)$. The sequence (ξ_n) now forms a normal sequence with respect to Lebesgue measure [4]. For our later notational convenience, we set

$$X_n = \xi_{2n} \quad \text{and } Y_n = \xi_{2n+1}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \tag{5.8}$$

The following theorem, which was already used in proving Theorem 4.1, will be needed to prove Theorem 5.4. The constants have been modified slightly for our purposes.

Theorem 5.3. *([8], p69) Consider the random trigonometric polynomial*

$$P(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{k} \xi_n f_n(t) \tag{5.9}$$

where the f_n are real or complex trigonometric polynomials of degree less than or equal to N, ξ_n a normal (or subnormal) sequence and $k < \infty$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|P\|_\infty \geq 6(\sum \|f_n\|_\infty^2 \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq \frac{8\pi}{N^2}. \tag{5.10}$$

The particular choice of constants is justified by setting $\rho = 2\pi N^2$ and $\kappa = N^2/4\pi$ in Theorem 1, p68 of [8].

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\{X_0, X_n, Y_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be as defined in (5.8). Then the series (5.6) converges to a continuous function whenever $W = W_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in KC$.*

Proof. The linear term clearly does not affect convergence, and we shall focus our attention on the sum. Firstly, consider the sum

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{X_n}{2\pi n} \sin 2\pi nt. \tag{5.11}$$

Note that this is merely a sum of cosines, such as we have been using, with a constant phase shift. The factor $1/2\pi$ will not have an effect on the convergence, and we dispense with it from here on, and also when bounding the terms involving Y_n. With $N_k = 2^{2^k}$ as in Theorem 4.1, let

$$P_k(t) = \sum_{n=N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1} \frac{X_n}{n} \sin 2\pi nt, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{5.12}$$

The series (5.11) can then be written as $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_k(t)$. Each P_k is a trigonometric polynomial of degree less that N_{k+1}. Using Theorem 5.3 as in Theorem 4.1 (but invoking Theorem 5.2 instead of Lemma 1.1), we have that for $\alpha \in KC$ and all large k,

$$\|P_k\|_\infty \leq 6 \left(2^{k/2} \left(\sum_{n=2^{2^k}}^{2^{2^{k+1}}-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \tag{5.13}$$

Now, since

$$\sum_{n=2^{2^k}}^{2^{2^{k+1}}-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \left(2^{2^{k-1}} \right)^{-2}, \tag{5.14}$$

we have that

$$\|P_k\|_\infty \leq 6\sqrt{\log 2} \cdot 2^{\frac{k+1}{2}} 2^{-2^{k-1}} < 6 \cdot 2^{-2^{k-2}} = 6N_{k-2}^{-1}. \tag{5.15}$$

The same technique will be used to compute the rate of convergence of the rest of the sum. Set

$$Q_k(t) = \sum_{n=N^k}^{N^{k+1}-1} \frac{Y_n}{n} (1 - \cos 2\pi nt). \tag{5.16}$$

Writing $1 - \cos 2\pi nt = 2\sin^2 \pi nt$, we observe that Theorem 5.3 must now be applied to trigonometric polynomials of degree less than or equal to $2N$. Otherwise, everything else used to obtain the previous

estimate (5.15) still applies, and we obtain

$$\|Q_k\|_\infty \leq 6\left(\log(2N_{k+1})\sum_{N_k}^{N_{k+1}-1}\frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 6\sqrt{\log 2}\left(2^{k+1}+1\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{n=2^{2^k}}^{2^{2^{k+1}}-1}\frac{1}{n^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{5.17}$$

$$< 6\cdot 2^{\frac{k+2}{2}}2^{-2^{k-1}} < 6\cdot 2^{-2^{k-2}} = 6N_{k-2}^{-1}. \tag{5.18}$$

for each $\alpha \in KC$. Since $\sum_k N_{k-2}^{-1}$ converges, the series (5.6) converges uniformly on $[0,1]$. □

Using the above estimates, we can now prove

Theorem 5.5. *The series (5.6) converges to a complex oscillation whenever $W = W_\alpha$, for each $\alpha \in KC$.*

The idea of the proof is identical to that of Proposition 2 of [4], and can be adapted to the present case using the estimates of Theorem 5.3.

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha \in KC$, but that W_α is not a complex oscillation. As in [4], we can then write

$$W_\alpha \in \bigcap_n \bigcup_m T_{n,m} \tag{5.19}$$

where each $T_{n,m}$ is of the form

$$\bigcap_{i<k}[A_i < X(t_i) < B_i]. \tag{5.20}$$

Here, A_i, B_i and t_i are dyadic rationals and k an integer, and an effective description of them all can be obtained from n and m. Moreover, $\mathbb{W}(\cup_m T_{n,m})$ converges effectively to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Without loss, we can assume that

$$\mathbb{W}\left(\bigcup_m T_{n,m}\right) \leq 2^{-n}. \tag{5.21}$$

Setting $N_j = 2^{2^j}$ as in the previous proof, let

$$W_\beta^{N_j}(t) = X_0 t + \sqrt{2}\sum_{n=1}^{N_j-1}\frac{1}{2\pi n}(X_n(\beta)\sin 2\pi nt + Y_n(\beta)(1-\cos 2\pi nt)). \tag{5.22}$$

Let $T_{n,m}$ be as in (5.20), noting that the parameter k can be effectively retrieved from n and m. Define $S_{n,m}$ by

$$\beta \in S_{n,m} \iff \forall_{i<k}\exists_{j>n+m+1}(A_i + N_j^{-1/6} < W_\beta^{N_j}(t_i) < B_i - N_j^{-1/6}). \tag{5.23}$$

The relation $\beta \in S_{n,m}$ is Σ_1^0 in β, n and m, keeping in mind that k is effectively retrievable from n and m.

By the previous proof, we can bound the tail of the series $P_j + Q_j$, as defined in (5.12) and (5.16). When necessary, we shall indicate the dependence on a specific $\beta \in \mathcal{N}$ by writing P_j^β and Q_j^β. Specifically, for each j we have that

$$\|P_j(t) + Q_j(t)\|_\infty \leq 12N_{j-2}^{-1} \tag{5.24}$$

for k large enough. Therefore, we get the bound

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\left\|\sum_{i=j}^{\infty}(P_i(t)+Q_i(t))\right\|_\infty \leq \frac{12}{\pi}2^{-2^{j-2}} = \frac{12}{\pi}N_{j-2}^{-1} \tag{5.25}$$

for large k. This allows us to state that, for a given $\alpha \in KC$, we can find some $j_0 = j_0(\alpha)$ such that

$$|W_\alpha(t) - W_\alpha^{N_j}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\left\|\sum_{i=j}^{\infty}(P_i(t)+Q_i(t))\right\|_\infty \leq \frac{12}{\pi}N_{j-2}^{-1}. \tag{5.26}$$

for all $j \geq j_0$. For $\alpha \in KC$ specified and j_0 determined, we want to show that

$$\alpha \in \bigcap_{n \geq j_0} \bigcup_m S_{n,m}. \tag{5.27}$$

For convenience, we now set $C = 12/\pi$. Let $n \geq j_0$, and choose m such that $x_\alpha \in T_{n,m}$. We can now find some $L > 0$ such that for all $i < k$,

$$A_i + \frac{1}{L} < W_\alpha(t_i) < B_i - \frac{1}{L}. \tag{5.28}$$

Now choose $j > n + m + 1$ such that $CN_{j-2}^{-1} + N_j^{-1/6} < L^{-1}$. By (5.26) and the fact that $j > j_0$,

$$W_\alpha(t_i) - CN_{j-2}^{-1} < W_\alpha^{N_j}(t_i) < W_\alpha(t_i) + CN_{j-2}^{-1}. \tag{5.29}$$

From the choice of j,

$$A_i + N_j^{-1/6} < W_\alpha^{N_j}(t_i) < B_i - N_j^{-1/6}, \tag{5.30}$$

and therefore $\alpha \in S_{n,m}$.

The aim is to show that $\cup_m S_{n,m}$ tends to 0 effectively, which would mean that α is contained in a Π_2^0 set of constructive measure 0, in contradiction to the assumption that $\alpha \in KC$. Therefore, suppose that $\beta \in S_{n,m}$, where $n \geq j_0$. We will now establish that if $\|P_j^\beta + Q_j^\beta\|_\infty \leq 12N_{j-2}^{-1}$ for all $j \geq n + m + 1$, then $W_\beta \in T_{n,m}$, where P_j^β and Q_j^β are the polynomials (5.12) and (5.16) for the variables X_n and Y_n parametrised by β. By definition of $S_{n,m}$, there are some i and $j > n + m + 1$ such that

$$A_i + N_j^{-1/6} < W_\beta^{N_j}(t_i) < B_i - N_j^{-1/6}. \tag{5.31}$$

Because of the assumed bounds on $P_j + Q_j$, for large j,

$$|W_\beta(t_i) - W_\beta^{N_j}(t_i)| \leq CN_{j-2}^{-1}, \tag{5.32}$$

and so

$$A_i + N_j^{-1/6} - CN_{j-2}^{-1} \leq W_\beta(t_i) \leq B_i - N_j^{-1/6} + CN_{j-2}^{-1}. \tag{5.33}$$

Except for a few initial terms, $N_j^{-1/6} - CN_{j-2}^{-1} > 0$, and we can assume that j_0 is also large enough for this to be true. For $n \geq j_0$ then, $W_\beta \in T_{n,m}$. This will also hold under the assumption that $\beta \in S_{n,m}$ and that both $\|P_j^\beta\|_\infty$ and $\|Q_j^\beta\|_\infty$ are bounded from above by $6N_{j-2}^{-1}$ for large j, since then the condition on $\|P_j^\beta + Q_j^\beta\|_\infty$ is clearly implied. If we now define $U_{n,m}$ by the relation

$$\beta \in U_{n,m} \iff \exists_{j>n+m+1} \left((\|P_j^\beta\|_\infty > 6N_{j-2}^{-1}) \vee (\|Q_j^\beta\|_\infty > 6N_{j-2}^{-1}) \right), \tag{5.34}$$

we can state that

$$(\beta \in S_{n,m}) \implies \exists_m [(W_\beta \in T_{n,m}) \vee \beta \in U_{n,m}]. \tag{5.35}$$

Utilising Theorem 5.3 again, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}[\|P_j^\beta\|_\infty > 6N_{j-2}^{-1}] < \mathbb{P}\left[\|P_j^\beta\|_\infty > 6 \left(2^{j+1} \log 2 \sum_{N_j}^{N_{j+1}-1} n^{-2} \right)^{1/2} \right] < 8\pi / N_{j+1}^2, \tag{5.36}$$

and the same for Q_j^β.

The final component necessary to bound the measure of $S_{n,m}$ is to note that, for $n \geq j_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\cup_m [\alpha : W_\alpha \in T_{n,m}]\right) = \mathbb{P}\left([\alpha : W_\alpha \in \cup_m T_{n,m}]\right) = \mathbb{W}\left(\cup_m T_{n,m}\right) \leq 2^{-n}, \tag{5.37}$$

by (5.21). We now have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\cup_m S_{n,m}\right) \leq 2^{-n} + \sum_{j>m+n+1} \frac{16\pi}{N_{j+1}^2}, \tag{5.38}$$

which converges to 0 effectively as $n \to \infty$. This contradicts the assumption that $\alpha \in KC$, which implies that W_α is indeed a complex oscillation. □

References

[1] Asarin, E.A. and Pokrovskii, A.V., Use of the Kolmogorov complexity in analyzing control system dynamics. *Automation and Remote Control*, 47:21–28, 1986.

[2] Davie, G., The Borel-Cantelli lemmas, probability laws and Kolmogorov complexity. *Ann. Prob.* 29 (4), 1426–1434.

[3] Fouché, W.L., Arithmetical representations of Brownian motion. *J. Symbolic Logic* 65 421–442, 2000.

[4] Fouché, W.L., The descriptive complexity of Brownian motion. *Advances in Mathematics*. 155(2):317–343, 2000.

[5] Fouché, W.L., Descriptive complexity and reflective properties of combinatorial configurations. *J. London Math. Soc.* 54, 199–208, 1996.

[6] Fouché, W.L., Mukeru, S., Davie, G., Fourier spectra of measures associated with algorithmically random Brownian motion. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, Vol. 10 (3:20) 1–24, 2014.

[7] Kjos-Hanssen, B., Nerode, A., The law of the iterated logarithm for algorithmically random Brownian motion, in: Proceedings on Logical Foundations of Computer Science, LFCS 2007, in: Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4514, 2007, pp 310–317.

[8] Kahane, J-P., *Some Random Series of Functions*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 1985

[9] Martin-Löf, P., The definition of random sequences. *Inform. and Control*, 9 602–619, 1966.

[10] Zygmund, A., *Trigonometric Series*, Cambridge University Press, 1959, vol. 1.